

Financial Regime-Switching Vector
Auto-Regression
Amendment October 2010
New claims, Office Action and Response

Application Number 10/805,314

Mark S. Tenney

Filed 22 March 2004

TC/A.U. 4172

Examiner William E. Rankins

Docket Number MST032204

Wednesday 20th October, 2010

Copyright ©2010 All rights reserved Mark S. Tenney.

Citizen of the United States

4313 Lawrence Street, Alexandria Virginia, 22309.

Phone number 703 799 0518.

Email: mfc@patriot.net

Contents

1	Intro	19
1.1	Modified introduction to response to March 4, 2010	20
2	Annotated Amendment to the Specification	25
2.1	Underlining review	26
2.2	Remove sentence	26
2 – 1	new definition	27
2.3	Additions to Specification	27
3 – 1	Steps in Regime Switching Economic Scenario Generation	28
3 – 1.1	Regime Switching VAR Time Node Step . . .	28
3 – 1.2	Regime Switching Time Node Loop	31

3 – 1.3	Scenario	32
3 – 1.4	Scenario Initialization	33
3 – 1.5	Scenario Loop	33
3 – 1.6	Regime Switching Scenario	34
3 – 1.7	Regime Switching Grids	34
3 – 1.8	One space variable one regime index example	35
3 – 1.9	Two space variable one regime index example	38
3	Claims	41
4	Office Opening	51
4.1	Office Action Opening	51
4.2	Response to September 22/23 2010 Office Action	51
2 – 1	Complete listing of the claims	51
2 – 2	Claims in ascending Order	52
2 – 3	Cover sheet and signature	52
4.3	Status of Claims	53
3 – 1	Office Statement	53

<i>CONTENTS</i>	5
3 – 2 Applicant Response to Office Statement	53
4.4 Response to Arguments.	53
4 – 1 Applicant Response to Office Statement	53
5 Office Specification Rejection	55
5.1 Specification Rejection New Matter	55
1 – 1 Office Statement	55
1 – 2 Applicant Response to Office Statement	56
1 – 2.1 2163.06	56
1 – 2.2 Annotated version of specification cites source for contents added	56
1 – 2.3 Examiner asked for tutorial	58
1 – 2.4 Applicant offered tutorial on side	59
1 – 2.5 Examiner said put tutorial in the specification	59
1 – 2.6 Applicant complied with examiner instruction	59
1 – 2.7 Measure theory makes finance very hard to read	62

1 – 2.8	Difficulty of math finance materials	64
1 – 2.9	Beaglehole Tenney 1991 and Bernanke praise Double Decay	64
1 – 2.10	Terminology of additions is used in specifica- tion or prior work or is in industry	66
1 – 2.11	Comparison of difficulty level of what added to finance literature and industry use	66
1 – 2.12	Comparison to Libor Market Model as typ- ically presented at a more difficult level for lay person	67
1 – 2.13	Request examiner to admit he asked for ap- plicant to draft a tutorial explanation for him in the personal interview	70
1 – 2.14	Request examiner to admit he instructed ap- plicant to put the tutorial in the specification not just give it him on the side for just him. .	70

CONTENTS 7

1 – 2.15 Request no new matter admission over original specification 70

6 Claims Rejections 71

6.1 Claim Rejections 35 USC 101 71

1 – 1 Office Statement Zero Statutory Classes in Claims 25
to 27 71

1 – 2 Applicant response 72

1 – 2.1 Applicant adopts method of use of a computer as start of redrafted claim 72

1 – 2.2 Comparison to claim 1 of 6125355 patent . . . 72

1 – 2.3 Office contradictory statements where admit
claims are to a method and apparatus 73

1 – 2.4 Computer system was used to indicate a method
of using a computer. 76

1 – 2.5 In the Bansal claims 25 to 27 based rejections,
USPTO reads in use of a computer as intended. 76

1 – 2.6	Use of computer indicated in specification . . .	77
1 – 2.7	Examiner asked for improvement format which implies improvement of something already statu- tory	77
1 – 2.8	Applicant requests admission that applicants current ESG computer software system is statu- tory	77
1 – 2.9	Applicant requests admission that improve- ments to applicants current ESG computer software system are statutory	78
1 – 2.10	Applicant requests admission that Academy of Actuaries ESG computer software system is statutory	78
1 – 2.11	Applicant requests admission that improve- ments of Academy of Actuaries ESG com- puter software system is statutory	80

1 – 2.12	Applicant requests USPTO to admit that using Economic Scenario Generators to comply with NAIC LHATF actual or draft regulations is statutory	80
1 – 2.13	Applicant requests USPTO to admit that using Economic Scenario Generators to comply with NAIC LHATF VM-20 actual or draft regulations is statutory	81
1 – 2.14	Applicant requests USPTO to draft claims . .	81
1 – 2.15	Equal protection and due process admissions requested	81
1 – 3	Office Statement Two Classes both method and apparatus in claims 29-31, 33-36, and 38-39	82
1 – 4	Applicant Response to Office Statement 2 Classes Issue	83
1 – 4.1	1 class not 2. method is the class in claims . .	83
1 – 4.2	Redraft to the method of using a computer . .	84

1 – 4.3	Ambiguity in phrase computer system	84
1 – 4.4	6125355 patent claim one	84
1 – 4.5	6125355 patent discussion	85
1 – 5	Office Statement Mathematical Operations only 25-29 .	91
1 – 6	Applicant Response to Office Statement	91
1 – 6.1	Note other 101 responses	91
1 – 6.2	USPTO read computer into Bansal for claim 25 to 27	91
1 – 6.3	USPTO finds two statutory classes for claim 29	92
1 – 6.4	USPTO derived one of the statutory classes in claim 29 from claim 28 already having a statutory class	93
1 – 6.5	USPTO conflicting statements	93
1 – 6.6	Bernanke praises practical use of BT 1991 model	94

CONTENTS

11

1 – 6.7	USPTO Bansal intends computer use	95
1 – 6.8	Practical use of ESG admission requested . . .	96
1 – 6.9	ESG's as much practical use as auto parts . . .	98
1 – 6.10	LHATF NAIC practical use of ESGs	98
1 – 6.11	Solvency 2 practical use ESG	98
1 – 6.12	Additions to the specification	99
1 – 6.13	People losing their homes is of practical im- portance	103
1 – 6.14	Better economic scenario methods help pre- vent financial crises	103
1 – 6.15	Improvements over what Bernanke praised are of practical value	104
1 – 6.16	Applicant has licensed DMRP ESG software without regime switching for over 10 years . .	105
1 – 6.17	What is sold in commerce is of practical value	105

1 – 6.18	Applicant’s methods are already widely used to manage risk in finance	106
1 – 6.19	Applicant repeats request to USPTO to draft claims	107
6.2	112 Rejection New Matter	108
2 – 1	Office Statement	108
2 – 2	Applicant Response to Office Statement	108
2 – 2.1	Examiner requested tutorial at basic intro level	108
2 – 2.2	Applicant offered tutorial to examiner on side	109
2 – 2.3	Examiner said to put the tutorial in the spec- ification.	109
2 – 2.4	Annotated version of specification cites source for contents added	111
2 – 2.5	Terminology already in specification and or prior work of applicant	112

2 – 2.6	For more detail see this amendment earlier discussion specification rejection	113
2 – 2.7	Discussion	114
2 – 2.8	Request examiner to admit he asked for ap- plicant to draft a tutorial explanation for him in the personal interview	115
2 – 2.9	Request examiner to admit he instructed ap- plicant to put the tutorial in the specification not just give it him on the side for just him. .	115
2 – 2.10	Request no new matter admission over origi- nal specification	115
2 – 2.11	Request no new matter in claims admission over original specification	116
2 – 2.12	Requests USPTO to draft claims for pro se based on original specification	116
6.3	112 Rejection Antecedent Basis	118

3 – 1	Office Statement	118
3 – 2	Applicant Response to Office Statement	120
3 – 2.1	MPEP quotation	120
3 – 2.2	Standard terms	124
3 – 2.3	More reference on outside of sphere and like .	124
3 – 2.4	Time node an essential part of a scenario . . .	124
3 – 2.5	Process to stochastic process	125
3 – 2.6	Scenarios in preamble in one case	125
3 – 2.7	Expected change is standard term and an in- herent part like outside of sphere	125
3 – 2.8	New Claims	126
3 – 2.9	Applicant happy to work with examiner on antecedent basis as other things	126
3 – 2.10	More on Specification Addition request at per- sonal interview	127
6.4	112 Rejection Method Apparatus	128

4 – 1	Office Statement Claims 29-31, 33-36, and 38-39 are method and apparatus at same time	128
4 – 2	Applicant Response to Office Statement	129
4 – 2.1	Computer System Phrase avoided in redraft .	129
6.5	103 Rejections	129
5 – 1	Office Statement Claim 25	129
5 – 2	Applicant Response to Office Statement	134
5 – 2.1	USPTO recognizes "computer system used above" in applicant claim 25 not just math- ematical operations and reads computer sys- tem into Bansal paper	134
5 – 2.2	Rejection on Bansal missed equity	134
5 – 2.3	Bansal CIR model has no equities	135
5 – 2.4	Why USPTO asked for introductory expla- nation added to specification.	136
6.6	Additional 103 Rejections	138

6 – 1	Office Statement Claim 26 USPTO reads use computer method into Bansal not just mathematical operations .	138
6 – 2	Applicant Response to Office Statement Claim 26 . . .	139
6 – 3	Office Statement Claim 27 USPTO reads use computer method into Bansal not just mathematical operations .	139
6 – 4	Applicant Response to Office Statement Claim 27 . . .	140
6 – 4.1	Further on computer and intended use	140
6 – 5	Office Statement Claims 28-39 same rationale	141
6 – 6	Applicant Response to Office Statement	141
6 – 6.1	Claims 28-39 contain matter not in Bansal . .	142
6 – 6.2	Claims 28-31 have DMRP not in Bansal . . .	142
6 – 6.3	32-35 additional restrictions over Bansal . . .	142
6 – 6.4	Claims 35-36 use numerical method unlike Bansal closed form formula	143
6 – 6.5	Claim 37-39 use exponential short term rate not in Bansal which is linear	143

CONTENTS

17

6 – 6.6	Applicant can help USPTO avoid mistakes in understanding like Bansal here	144
---------	---	-----

6 – 6.7	Applicants prior published formulas are a basic part of math of the CIR models which Bansal builds on	145
---------	---	-----

6 – 6.8	Relation to other parts of amendment	145
---------	--	-----

7	Office Action Conclusion	149
----------	---------------------------------	------------

7.1	Conclusion	149
-----	----------------------	-----

1 – 1	Office Statement	149
-------	----------------------------	-----

1 – 2	Applicant Response to Office Statement	151
-------	--	-----

8	Closing	153
----------	----------------	------------

	Bibliography	153
--	---------------------	------------

